

-9-

Vaughn S. Iverson  
Appl. No. 09/731,522

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 1-45 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 23, and 28 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 23, and 39 are sought to be amended. Claim 45 is sought to be added. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

***Objection to the Specification***

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has objected to the Specification because of an informality. Specifically, on page 7, line 18 of the Specification, user interface 108 is mistakenly referred to as user interface 128. Applicant has amended the Specification accordingly. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the amended Specification and withdraw this rejection.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, states that claims 1-9, 23-25, 27, 29, 39, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US 2002/0003584 to Kossin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,424 to Zernov *et al.* (hereinafter "Zernov"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

-10-

Vaughn S. Iverson  
Appl. No. 09/731,522

The Examiner states that Kossin substantially teaches Applicant's invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 23. However, the Examiner admits, and Applicant agrees, that Kossin does not teach or suggest "the case varying in thickness in areas [of the camera that cover fragile camera components] where reinforcement is needed." The Examiner further states that Zernov teaches this element.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Zernov does not teach or suggest Applicant's element of:

a sealed case surrounding the digital camera, *the case varying in thickness in areas of the camera that cover fragile camera components in which reinforcement is needed*, the case constructed and arranged for providing a water resistant enclosure for the camera and adapted for transmission of the image from the image sensor to a display located external to the case without opening the case.

The sections of Zernov cited by the Examiner (Figures 3, 8-9, items 18, 20, and 39) do not show the camera housing varying in thickness in areas of the camera that cover fragile camera components in which reinforcement is needed. Instead, Zernov teaches flexible webs 20 that radiate from the rubberized housing for the camera to support a ballast weight 18 or a support 39. *Zernov*, col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 10; col. 5, lines 1-5; Figs. 3 and 8. Support 39 allows the camera to rest on the bottom of a lake. *Id.* at col. 5, lines 1-5. Ballast weight 18 stabilizes the camera and adds weight to minimize the length of cable that must be deployed. *Id.* at col. 4, lines 8-10. Thus, unlike the present invention, which claims a "case varying in thickness in areas of the camera that cover fragile camera components in which reinforcement is needed," Zernov teaches attachments to the housing that allow the camera to rest on the bottom of a lake or that stabilize the camera and add weight to minimize the length of the cable.

-11-

Vaughn S. Iverson  
Appl. No. 09/731,522

Thus, neither Kossin nor Zernov, separately or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 23. For at least the reasons stated above, independent claims 1 and 23, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-22 and 39-45, and claims 24-27, respectively) are patentable over the cited references of Kossin, and Zernov. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 23, and the claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 29 depends from independent claim 28, which is patentable over Kossin for at least the reasons stated below. Furthermore, Zernov does not teach or suggest the features missing from Kossin. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 29.

The Examiner, on page 6 of the Office Action, states that claims 10-22, 26, and 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US 2002/0003584 to Kossin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,512,941 to Takahashi *et al* (hereinafter "Takahashi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 10-22 depend from independent claim 1, which is patentable over Kossin for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Takahashi does not teach or suggest the features missing from Kossin. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 10-22.

Claim 26 depends from independent claim 23, which is patentable over Kossin for at least the reasons stated above. Furthermore, Takahashi does not teach or suggest the

-12-

Vaughn S. Iverson  
Appl. No. 09/731,522

features missing from Kossin. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 26.

Claims 30-38 depend from independent claim 28, which is patentable over Kossin for at least the reasons stated below. Furthermore, Takahashi does not teach or suggest the features missing from Kossin. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 30-38.

The Examiner, on page 9 of the Office Action, has rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. US 2002/0003584 to Kossin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,512,941 to Takahashi *et al* (hereinafter "Takahashi") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,669,020 to Hopmeyer. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 28, the Examiner states that Kossin substantially teaches Applicant's invention and that Takahashi teaches Applicant's "advanced on-screen controls," but does not teach the sealed buttons that control the focus system, shutter, zoom lens, and *f*-stop settings. The Examiner further states Hopmeyer discloses the sealed buttons.

Applicant respectfully agrees that Takahashi does not teach the sealed buttons that control the focus system, shutter, zoom lens, and *f*-stop settings. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Hopmeyer teaches sealed buttons. Although Hopmeyer teaches controls for apertures and focus controls, these controls do not appear to be sealed buttons. Instead, Hopmeyer uses knobs. Hopmeyer, col. 3, lines 9-16.

-13-

Vaughn S. Iverson  
Appl. No. 09/731,522

Thus, neither Kossin, Takahashi, nor Hopmeyer, separately or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claim 28. For at least the reasons stated above, independent claim 28, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 29-38) are patentable over the cited references of Kossin, Takahashi, and Hopmeyer. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 28, and the claims that depend therefrom.

-14-

Vaughn S. Iverson  
Appl. No. 09/731,522

**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

s:/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/  
Crystal D. Sayles  
Senior Attorney  
Intel Americas, Inc.  
(202) 986-3179

Dated: July 13, 2005

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States. Patent and Trademark Office at:	
Fax No.: 703-872-9306	
Signature <u>RAB</u>	Date <u>7/13/05</u>
Rachael Brown	

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**